

Edwin Westbrook to be postmaster at Mart, Tex., in place of Iona Cooke. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Clarence Lamoine Power to be postmaster at Temple, Tex., in place of T. J. Darling. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

VIRGINIA

Bard E. Fitzgerald to be postmaster at Gretna, Va., in place of N. L. Adams, resigned.

Charles F. Shumaker to be postmaster at Lovettsville, Va., in place of C. E. Virts. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1936.

WASHINGTON

Dewey Harvel Baker to be postmaster at Naches, Wash., in place of J. C. Blevins. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1936.

WEST VIRGINIA

Reuben Williams to be postmaster at Glen Rogers, W. Va., in place of Reuben Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

WISCONSIN

Elsie M. Dussault to be postmaster at Land O'Lakes, Wis., in place of F. D. Keithley. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Ralph E. Lyon to be postmaster at Strum, Wis., in place of E. E. Strand. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

Margaret McGonigle to be postmaster at Sun Prairie, Wis., in place of F. I. Conner. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 25 (legislative day of May 12), 1936

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Paul Zimmerman, Earlville.
Wilbur C. Gerke, Edwardsville.
Albert H. Winter, Highland.
Walter D. Hayes, Minonk.
Joseph L. Langan, Odell.
George S. Thornton, Oquawka.
Mary M. Spurgeon, Prairie City.
Charles W. McDonald, Wheaton.
Ralph M. Short, Witt.

KANSAS

Raymond R. Staab, Satanta.
James P. Kelley, White Cloud.

MAINE

William G. Chamberlain, Fort Fairfield.
Bess M. Clark, Milo.
Harry V. Smith, Springfield.
Roy E. Swaney, Vanceboro.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 25, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Consider and hear us, O Lord our God: Lead us to walk uprightly and work righteousness and speak the truth in our hearts. We lift our prayer to the throne of Eternal Light, where there is life, joy unspeakable, and which is full of glory. Grant us Thy holy spirit that we may grow in mind, in soul, and in appreciation of all things worth while. Be with us in our struggles and in our triumphs; may we never neglect to praise Thee for that power which brings us into the joy and liberty of life. Heavenly Father, bless our own true America, which is composed of a God-fearing and family-loving people, ever holding to the ideals which have

been the guide and the guardian of our destiny. Blessed Master and Friend, be with our President, our Speaker, and the entire Congress. Grant us the largest portion of Thy spirit with which to do the work entrusted to us. When Thy wings spread against the gray nightfall give us rest and peace.

We wait a moment. Again we have been made deeply conscious of the brevity of time and the frailty of human life. Again the roll has been called and there is no response. Again the silver cord has broken and a noble and upright public servant has left us. O give his family and all his loved ones the Christian's peace and consolation. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 22, 1936, was read and approved.

PRESERVATION OF THE GIBRALTAR WATERSHED IS OF THE UTMOST IMPORTANCE TO THE CITIZENS OF THE CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Speaker, one of the loveliest communities in all the world is Santa Barbara, Calif. It has climate, beautiful surroundings, high type citizens, access to the sea, majestic mountains in the background, and everything else necessary to make it the most comfortable community on earth in which to live. I invite you all to visit us, but I warn you now that if you come, come prepared to stay, for few ever desire to leave once they have tasted the pleasure of living in that glorious place.

With all of its natural assets, however, Santa Barbara has always been dependent, and will always be dependent, upon a supply of fresh water which emanates from the Gibraltar watershed in the mountains back of the community.

Soon after coming to Congress civic officials and Government agents in the Santa Barbara area came to me and asked me to sponsor a bill in Congress which would protect the watershed area. This bill was introduced under the title of H. R. 6544. I was able to push it through the various committees and it has become a law—Public No. 526, Seventy-fourth Congress. As the title of the law indicates, its purpose is to conserve the water resources and to encourage reforestation of the watersheds of Santa Barbara County, Calif.

This new law, I am confident, will preserve the city of Santa Barbara from one of its greatest dangers—fire. Fire, the demon of the forests and a ruthless destroyer of watersheds, is an unpredictable element, and the best we can do is to utilize every possible expedient in preventing its inception.

I recently received a letter from S. A. Nash-Boulden, supervisor of the Santa Barbara National Forest, in which he stated:

If you are successful in getting this bill (H. R. 6544) through Congress, it will mean a great deal to the city of Santa Barbara in the development and protection of the Gibraltar watershed, and may save them considerable trouble and expense in any further development work within the area.

Many interesting points were discussed in the Public Lands Committee of the House when the bill was under consideration, and for the benefit of those who are familiar with the situation out there, I am taking the liberty of quoting from my testimony before the committee.

Hon. RENÉ L. DEROUEN, chairman of the committee, was presiding. My testimony follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. STUBBS, do you choose to address yourself to this bill?

Mr. STUBBS. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that much need to be said on this bill, because it is so meritorious. This was requested by the city of Santa Barbara on behalf of the citizens of that community. Most of you know our crying need for water, and this city of about 35,000 inhabitants derives its main supply of domestic water from the Gibraltar Dam, situated in mountains overlooking the city. Some years ago—in 1932, I believe—approximately 132 square miles of 199 square miles of the forest watershed drainage area were practically denuded by the great Militija fire, which resulted in silt flowing into the Gibraltar Dam, and now we find 28-percent silt in this dam, and it was constructed only 10 years ago.

In other words, unless something is done to prevent erosion and these devastating fires, we cannot conceive of what might happen to this beautiful little city and the communities lying about it which represent an additional 15,000 or 20,000 people.

Nothing but good can come from this bill. There have never been any minerals found in this watershed in the course of a century of time, perhaps, as a result of spasmodic explorations which have been chronicled. It will be for the interest of that community, I am sure. It is not my home city, but it is my home county, and there has been no objection raised from any source. In fact, just the reverse is true. Now, the fact that both Departments—Interior and Agriculture—have acted favorably leads me to request the committee to vote out this bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. How does this affect the discovery of oil?

Mr. STUBBS. It does not affect that.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It does affect the entry under the mining laws, as I understand it.

Mr. STUBBS. That is the idea. Men go up there prospecting, and innumerable fires are the result. There is nothing to be accomplished by that prospecting. There is nothing else to do, and the community feels—all the county seems to feel—that the bill should be passed. The superintendent of the national forest there has written a letter urging its enactment. We are continually having trouble with fires.

Mr. WHITE. Let me ask a question. Is the land embraced within the provisions of this bill all now within a national forest?

Mr. STUBBS. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Could you tell us, if this law was enacted, how you would encourage reforestation or protect watersheds by the terms of the act any more than the Forest Service now protects it?

Mr. STUBBS. Well, perhaps more to prevent future fires. The C. C. C. camps are located in there now. The Government is trying to rebuild this devastated forest area. By replanting of watersheds and building truck trails, and such as that, the Government is spending a large sum of money. A number of C. C. C. camps in the area now are trying to build up the district, and if future prospecting work is carried on there promiscuously we believe that it would serve no good purpose. A devastating fire might occur at any time. The last great fire in 1932 cost an estimated \$70,000,000. But there was one authority on the subject who told me that the loss in forest assets would reach \$700,000,000. We are trying to save our watersheds. They are California's greatest assets and Santa Barbara needs this one.

Mr. WHITE. Will you tell us how the provisions of this act barring entry of mining claims in this area is going to promote the reforestation or protect the watershed? Can you explain that to us?

Mr. STUBBS. Just as I stated, the Government is spending a good deal of money in there now trying to rebuild that watershed and to prevent soil erosion, which is at the present time the result of these fires. Useless and fruitless prospecting endangers the watershed and the Santa Barbara Reservoir. We all feel that it would provide real protection, and there is nothing harmful that could come from this bill.

Mr. WHITE. Don't you think that if there are mineral resources in there, wealthy mineral in this area, that the passage of this law will bar its development and leave those resources undeveloped and latent?

Mr. STUBBS. Not necessarily so. I think the report from the Secretary of Agriculture states that if there are any healthy symptoms, need for mineral development, that terms can be granted quickly. In other words, it seems like we are trying to regulate a hazardous condition that is endangering the lives and property of a great community.

Mr. MOTT. How big did you say that watershed is—how many square miles?

Mr. STUBBS. Well, the actual number of square miles is 196, affecting the reservoir area, and 200,000 acres in all are involved in this particular bill.

Mr. MOTT. And the town is how big?

Mr. STUBBS. The town is 35,000, but the country—the back country—back of the city of Santa Barbara represents more than 15,000 population.

Mr. WHITE. This is a colony of millionaires in Santa Barbara, isn't it?

Mr. STUBBS. I am glad you asked that question, because I believe it would be apropos to tell you something about the city of Santa Barbara and vicinity, and something about the people who reside there. Santa Barbara is a city which nestles in the cup of a mountain range where it touches the sea. It is famed for its beautiful homes, where many families of great wealth and prestige reside, but it also has many other attractions. It is probably one of the most attractive communities of the world, being surrounded by commanding mountain peaks, and by the sparkling and peaceful Pacific Ocean, where yachts, motorboats, and other types of sea vessels are operated by those who reside there. The people are of the highest type. Many of them trace their ancestry back to the founders of California. All who once see this beautiful community long to remain there permanently.

Regardless of what others might say, it is my belief that Santa Barbara is the paradise of the Pacific, because of its healthy atmosphere, its glamorous air, its high type citizenry, attractive buildings, and other factors which go into the development of a splendid community—all these Santa Barbara has in abundance, and these are what I want to save from destruction. The very lives of the citizens are at stake, because they naturally require pure water in abundance, not only now, but the certainty that

this supply will be protected for future generations. Water is king out in my country.

There has been some question raised concerning the protection of current mining development and the right to develop any mineral deposits of value which might be discovered in the future. If you will permit me to refer to the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, you will note that the city obtains its principal supply of water from the forest area. You will also note that the land has not been found, even with prospecting over a long period of time, to contain valuable deposits as far as is known now, but under the existing law they are subject to location and entry under the mineral statutes; but under the mineral laws, in view of the provision for the restoration of valuable mineral lands to location and entry by the President, and upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, valid rights are adequately protected.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand it, the provisions of this bill would invalidate any mineral location.

Mr. STUBBS. Not present locations.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the opinion of the chairman that, after the passing of the law, they could be easily obtained?

The CHAIRMAN. I cannot pass on that—I am sorry. I do not know how that would be interpreted, or how easy it is.

Mr. MOTT. I will tell you. It is our experience, and I have had several bills in at the last session like this, that you cannot protect your watershed if you let anybody go in there to live, or homestead, or mine, or anything else. If you have a watershed that you want properly protected either from fire or from insubstantial conditions, you have to keep people out of it.

The CHAIRMAN. It is moved and seconded that the report on H. R. 6544 be made. All in favor signify by saying aye. [A chorus of ayes.]

Those who are not in favor will say no.

Mr. WHITE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The ayes have it. One no.

And thereupon, Mr. Speaker, the bill was presented to the House and passed. It passed the Senate with the aid of Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, who defended it in the upper Chamber, and was approved by the President.

This law, I know, will not only protect the water rights of the citizens who depend upon the Gibraltar watershed for domestic and agricultural water needs, but it will assist materially in advancing recreational activities, grazing, propagation of wildlife, and a host of other important and necessary activities which follow naturally when we take good care of our forest and watershed areas.

ROBINSON-PATMAN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN BUSINESS BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 8442, is expected to receive consideration Tuesday, May 26, 1936, immediately after disposal of the vocational education bill. There will be 1 hour's debate on the rule for consideration of our bill and 4 hours' general debate after the adoption of the rule. Then the bill will be read under the 5-minute rule. It will possibly be late Wednesday evening before the bill is finally disposed of, but those of us who are sponsoring the legislation are hopeful that the bill can be disposed of before adjournment Wednesday night. The Honorable JOHN E. MILLER will have charge of the bill for the Judiciary Committee.

OTHER QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

In the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, May 21, on page 7969, I inserted questions and answers relating to this bill. I am inserting herewith additional questions and answers:

STOCK DEFENSE TO ANY EQUAL-RIGHTS BILL

1. Question. What will be the tactics of the opposition?

Answer. As usual, it will be contended by many that they are in favor of just this type of legislation, but opposed to this particular bill. It is the same old stock defense that is used to oppose any kind of legislation along this line. Witnesses appeared before the Judiciary Committee and the Rules Committee of the House and stated that they favored what the bill seeks to do, but offered critical objections to the bill as proposed to do what we wanted and what they wanted, according to their arguments. It is interesting to note that the ones who are opposing this bill have never suggested to the committee that considered it a bill that will do what we want done that they would favor, although they

claim that they favor what we are proposing to do. The House Judiciary Committee considered this bill for almost a year.

FARM ORGANIZATIONS

2. Question. The newspapers a few days ago reported that representatives of several farm organizations have issued a statement in opposition to the Robinson-Patman bill. Are the farmers opposing this legislation?

Answer. I believe the farmers and their organizations will support this bill. It is true that a letter was written to the Honorable JOHN J. O'CONNOR, chairman of the Rules Committee, by representatives of several farm organizations, stating that they were writing on behalf of the farmers of the country and asked that the bill be given further study. In the letter it was stated:

As representatives of the organized farmers of this country, we are in favor of legislation to eliminate false brokerage allowances, false advertising allowances, and unreasonable quantity discounts where such discounts are made available only to a very limited number of customers.

In another part of the letter they stated that—

The bill should go over until the next session of Congress and be more carefully reviewed and studied with a view to writing a bill which will correct the abuses complained of.

At the time this letter was written, our bill contained two amendments that were objectionable to these farm organizations: One was the definition of price, section 5 of the House bill, known as the antibasing point provision; and the other one was the classification section, classifying distributors into groups such as wholesalers, retailers, brokers, jobbers, and so forth. Since that time the sponsors of this legislation have agreed to eliminate both these amendments. The Judiciary Committee has met and instructed the chairman, the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, to offer amendments to the bill on the floor to strike these provisions from the bill. Undoubtedly they will be eliminated.

Therefore these farm organizations will certainly support the legislation in favor of correcting the abuses that our bill is intended to correct.

NOT SUBSTITUTE FOR N. R. A.

3. Question. It has been stated in the public press that the Robinson-Patman bill is a substitute for the N. R. A. Is this true?

Answer. No; it is not true. This bill has no connection whatsoever with the N. R. A. It seeks to correct abuses and unfair advantages that are generally known, condoned by a few but never encouraged or defended by any except the special few who are profiting by reason of them. No one will openly defend these abuses, and the Members of Congress will not hear a Member of the House of Representatives attempt to defend the abuses this bill seeks to correct.

WILL RETAILERS HAVE TO COME TO WASHINGTON BEFORE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION?

4. Question. If this bill is passed, will it require the million and a half retail stores to defend their rights before the Federal Trade Commission?

Answer. No; this bill does not deal with the retail distributor. It merely grants one retail distributor the same rights and benefits as other retail distributors under the same conditions. About the only concern that will be called upon to defend itself before the Federal Trade Commission will be the manufacturer who cheats his customers by charging to certain customers more for the same quantity and under the same conditions than he charges others. This practice will be prohibited by this bill, which requires equal rights to all customers and special privileges to none. Many large manufacturers now have this policy. This bill will force all chisellers and cheaters to adopt Golden Rule policies.

PRICES NOT INCREASED

5. Question. Will the bill affect in any way retail prices?

Answer. No; a manufacturer will be compelled to sell all customers the same quantity at the same price. The retailer who purchases from the manufacturer will not be required to maintain a price. Manufacturers will compete among themselves, but each manufacturer must treat his own cus-

tomers fairly and squarely and not charge one more for the same quantity under the same conditions than he charges another. This is enforcing common honesty.

QUANTITY PURCHASES RECOGNIZED

6. Question. Will this bill prevent a large purchaser from receiving a lower price for a large quantity than a small purchaser receives for a small quantity?

Answer. No; the bill recognizes that there should be a difference in the selling price based upon differences in cost of manufacture and distribution. In other words, if 50,000 units of a commodity are ordered from a manufacturer and he can produce these units for 5 cents less per unit by reason of the large order than he could produce a thousand such units, there is nothing in the bill which will prevent the lower price being given for the large quantity purchased. In this case the buyer of a thousand such units will pay 5 cents more per unit because there is a difference in the cost of manufacture of that amount. The only exception is that where a particular commodity is purchased in such great quantities by a very few large buyers that these large buyers would soon obtain a monopoly in the distribution of that commodity, then the Federal Trade Commission may establish a quantity limit upon the showing that there is danger of a monopoly, and when that quantity limit is fixed, any purchaser or group of purchasers who buy the quantity limit so fixed will receive the same price per quantity unit as the large mass buyers who purchase several such quantity units. This power of the Federal Trade Commission cannot be invoked unless there is danger of monopoly and upon proof being made that there is danger of monopoly.

WILL NOT COMPEL HIGHER PRICES TO CHAINS

7. Question. Will this bill compel chain and department stores to pay a higher price?

Answer. It is not intended to require anyone to pay a higher price, but it is intended to compel a manufacturer who selects a customer—and in this bill power is expressly reserved for the manufacturer to select his customers—to give each customer the same fair deal and the same prices for the same quantities under the same conditions. This bill will not increase prices. It will lower prices to consumers, since independents who are now refused equal rights with other customers of a manufacturer will be given these rights under this law, which will result in a lower price to them. This law will cause keener competition and lower prices to consumers.

MIDDLEMEN

8. Question. Is there anything in this bill that will require middlemen to be used?

Answer. Absolutely nothing. The only provision about brokers and wholesalers will merely prevent fees and commissions ordinarily paid to brokers and wholesalers from being used as bribes.

VOLUNTARIES FOR BILL

9. Question. Are the voluntary groups of grocers, druggists, and other opposing this bill?

Answer. Only where their executives and promoters are making money off of them by exploiting the menace of the chain store to the independent merchant. The bill will make it easier for the voluntary to protect its members against the chain, because it places a halter on chain abuses. And this bill will make the voluntary more effective in securing that protection, because it will guarantee its members prices on pool purchases on an equal basis with their largest chain competitor.

Any voluntary is, therefore, very foolish to oppose this bill. Under existing law, a number of owners of stores can go in together, buy collectively, and receive a better price by reason of the quantity purchased. An investigation has disclosed, however, that such groups do not receive as good a price as the corporate chains, although they purchase the same quantities. Besides, under existing law, manufacturers can cut them off entirely any time they want to and refuse to give them any discount or rebate whatsoever. Some leaders in these groups have been led to believe that they are already getting more than certain other groups, and efforts are being made to get them to oppose the bill. The

fact is that no one knows the special discounts that the other customers of a manufacturer are receiving, and an investigation has disclosed that only the big corporate chains receive certain big rebates.

HOLDERS OF PRIVILEGE OPPOSE BILL

10. Question. Why is this bill so bitterly opposed?

Answer. A few people are enjoying great privileges from manufacturers. These few have become greedy, which is perfectly natural. One large corporate chain is paying its president, vice president, and general superintendents \$2,000,000 a year. This \$2,000,000 represents about one-fourth of the special rebates this concern receives from manufacturers. Six of these officials draw salaries of more than \$100,000 a year each. They are afraid if this law should be passed and they have to pay the same price for the same quantity of merchandise under the same conditions that their big salaries will be in jeopardy; that they will possibly have to accept a reduction. This is not at all pleasing to them. Evidently they have in mind increases rather than reductions.

SECTIONS AND GROUPS AFFECTED

11. Question. Which sections of the country and groups are most vitally affected by this legislation?

Answer. The manufacturer who deals fairly with his customers will not be affected by this bill. It was stated before a committee of the House that 90 percent of those affected by the bill reside in a small area in the heart of New York City. They are profiting to the extent of millions of dollars a year through their chiseling, cheating, racketeering tactics. Their policies are destructive not only to small business, small manufacturers and distributors, but also to the consumers including the farmers and wage earners. All sections of the country are affected, and all groups, but the unfair privileges are held by a small group in a small area.

HOW GREEDY KEEP THEIR PRIVILEGES

12. Question. How do the few greedy people who are opposed to the Golden Rule in business most effectively prevent the enactment of such a bill as the Robinson-Patman Bill?

Answer. By seeking delay, by confusion of the issue, and by downright misrepresentations. A congressional investigation has shown that these people use farmers and other consumers as a front or stuffed shirt to act as their mouthpiece. They do not come out into the open themselves as their arguments will not stand the light; but different methods and tactics are used to get the so-called consumers, farmers, and wage earners to plead their cause for a consideration. One who advocates the enactment of a law is at a great disadvantage since he has such hazards before him as delay and all kinds of misrepresentations. On the other hand, one who is opposing the enactment of a bill has many things to his advantage. A whispering campaign is often resorted to to disturb the members. Every method on earth is used to delay consideration and the more confusion by misrepresentations or otherwise that is injected into the issue, the better chance there is of defeat of the bill.

DANGER OF MONOPOLY

13. Question. Why do you say there is danger of monopoly?

Answer. There is not a danger of monopoly at this time in every line of business, but in the lines of business in which corporate chains are engaged there is already a monopoly in many of the favorite areas in this country. In determining the extent that corporate chains have gone in the direction of monopoly, comparisons should be restricted to the areas in which the corporate chains operate and the lines of business in which they are engaged. For instance, in community A, there is a million dollars' worth of retail distribution business a year. Let us suppose that the corporate chains only do 25 percent of that business, or \$250,000. Without further investigation you would say that there is no danger of monopoly, but suppose that the \$250,000 of business represents all of the grocery business in that community for that year and that is the only business in which the chains are engaged in that area. That would

show conclusively that in the grocery business in that area that they have a complete monopoly although they are only doing 25 percent of the total retail business, which includes all retail distribution.

Suppose a corporate chain has 10,000 outlets, and it opens a thousand new outlets. These thousand new outlets are in competition with local merchants who have spent their lifetime building up goodwill and the business in which they are engaged. This corporate chain desires to destroy the competitors around these thousand new stores. Under the existing system all they have to do is to let these thousand stores have all their secret rebates obtained by reason of their purchases for all their 11,000 stores and this will enable the thousand new stores to soon destroy their competitors. When these competitors are destroyed, a thousand more stores can be opened and their competitors destroyed in a similar manner. The losses in one place are made up not only by the secret rebates obtained on total purchases but also on higher prices charged to consumers in areas where they already have a monopoly of business where their competitors have already folded up.

THE LOW PRICE CONSUMERS SHOULD RECEIVE

14. Question. Is it better for consumers to receive a real low price?

Answer. Yes; consumers should receive the lowest price possible. That does not mean, however, that we should not look into the future and determine the effect of present destructive policies if permitted to continue. For instance, because a corporate chain is bribing or baiting their customers with real low prices while their competitors are being destroyed does not mean that the consumers will continue to get those prices after competition is destroyed; it means that the sky will be the limit as to prices and the people will pay what monopoly says they should pay. On the other hand, the farmers will be compelled to accept the price for what they produce that monopoly says they must accept. The wage earners will be compelled to accept the wage that monopoly fixes. Such a policy in the direction of monopoly is destructive to the best interests of our country. It just happens that the independent merchants are victim no. 1. Farmers and wage earners will be victim no. 2, and the consumers of the country will be victim no. 3.

The consumers are entitled to the lowest price consistent with a fair price to the producer of raw materials, a fair wage to those who convert the raw materials into the finished product, and a fair cost of distribution to the consumers. Remember, that the 26,000,000 people dependent upon agriculture, the 36,000,000 people dependent upon mechanical and manufacturing pursuits, the 11,000,000 people dependent upon transportation and communication, the 9,000,000 people dependent upon professional services, and the 18,000,000 people dependent upon distribution for a livelihood are also consumers and they are interested in fair prices and fair wages.

GOOD PRICES AND GOOD WAGES

15. Question. Why are good prices and good wages necessary?

Answer. The American people owe \$250,000,000,000 in debts. The minimum tax burden is fixed for the next 40 years. If prices and wages are reduced 50 percent, our debt burden will be doubled and our tax burden will be doubled in what the people will have to pay with. There is only one way that this country can readjust itself and that is for us to force, if necessary, a policy of live and let live, and compel the Golden Rule in business in order that the people may pay their debts and taxes and in order that they may have purchasing power. The farmers cannot buy what the wage earners and the manufacturing plants of this country produce unless they have buying power.

A TOWNSEND PLAN CATECHISM

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, I submit a catechism on the Townsend plan in the hope it may aid in a better understanding of some features of that proposal:

Question. What is the Townsend plan?

Answer. A plan to pay every citizen over 60 years of age a pension sufficient to make his monthly income \$200 per month, provided such person retires from all gainful employment and agrees to spend all the money each month.

Question. What is the main purpose of the plan?

Answer. To provide large incomes for persons over 60, and thus spending this money to aid economic recovery.

Question. Does the plan provide any care or aid for widows, orphans, cripples, blind, indigents, or those under 60 in poverty or distress?

Answer. It does not.

Question. Would large property owners, with little or no net income, be eligible?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Would a man over 60, with \$30,000 and an income of \$1,200, receive a pension, while a widow under 60, with dependent children and without property, would receive nothing?

Answer. Yes.

Question. If the object of the Townsend plan is to compel the circulation of money, why not compel the person who earns the money to spend it as he sees fit instead of giving it to somebody else to spend?

Answer. It is a harsh thing to take a man's earnings away from him by taxes and give them to others to spend for any old purpose, useful or not.

Question. Can a pensioner 60 or over, having a wife younger than himself, and minor children, make provision for them out of his pension so that they may be cared for after his death?

Answer. He cannot. He must spend his entire pension and save nothing.

Question. In event of the death of a pensioner, leaving a wife under 60 and minor children, how are they provided for?

Answer. They go on county relief as at present.

Question. Could not some kind-hearted pensioner support the widow and family?

Answer. The plan limits all gifts to persons or institutions to 10 percent of the pension and out of this must come all contributions to churches, lodges, and charity.

FINANCING THE PLAN

Question. How is it proposed to finance the plan?

Answer. Principally by what is called a transaction tax of 2 percent.

Question. What is a transaction tax?

Answer. Roughly, it is a tax on all business transactions and on every dollar of wages earned and the value of goods or property bought or sold. It closely resembles a sales tax but is more far-reaching and taxes many transactions now exempt under ordinary sales taxes.

Question. Would the tax apply to food and clothes?

Answer. Yes; to both.

Question. What will be the cost of these pensions?

Answer. That depends on the number who qualify. The advocates of the plan estimate the cost from eighteen to twenty-four billions of dollars per year. There are more than 11,000,000 persons over 60 in the United States and over 10,000,000 eligibles. If all these apply, the cost at the beginning would be twenty-four billions a year. Within another generation the cost would be forty-eight billions a year.

Question. What is the population of the United States?

Answer. 122,775,046, according to the 1930 census.

Question. What must be contributed through transaction taxes to raise this 24 billions annually?

Answer. An average of \$195.40 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Question. How can you prove that?

Answer. Simply by dividing the amount to be raised by the total number of the population.

Question. What would this transaction tax cost a family of five persons?

Answer. \$977 per year or about \$2.67 per day, including Sundays.

AMOUNT OF BUSINESS NECESSARY TO RAISE TAX

Question. What amount of transactions or business must be done annually for each man, woman, and child to raise these pensions?

Answer. An average of \$9,770.

Question. Enormous! Can you prove that?

Answer. Prove it yourself.

Question. How?

Answer. You have already proved by the census that the cost of raising this pension of 24 billions would be \$195.40 for each man, woman, and child. This \$195.40, therefore, represents 2 percent of the amount of transactions necessary to raise the pensions.

Question. Correct, so far.

Answer. Now divide this \$195.40 by 2 (the percent of the tax) and you have \$97.70, or 1 percent of the per capita expense of the pensions.

Question. Correct, but proceed.

Answer. Multiply this 1 percent, or \$97.70 by 100, and you have \$9,770 as the average amount per capita of the transactions, taxed at the 2 percent, necessary to raise the pensions.

Question. But would not big business pay most of this tax?

Answer. No. The rich man may pay a tax on production, but adds it to the cost, and is repaid by the higher cost paid by the consumer. There are few rich people. They may spend much for their own consumption, but there are so many poor people, or persons of moderate income, who spend much or all their income for their necessities, that over 90 percent of the cost of the pensions would be borne by families having an income of less than \$2,500 a year.

Question. How much tax would the average man, if his family averaged five persons, pay from the time he was 20 until he was 60?

Answer. \$39,080.

Question. What would he and his family get if he died at 59?

Answer. Nothing from the Townsend plan except hard work to support others. If a good man, he might get a place in heaven. He would have to die to get that reward.

RETIRING AGED PERSONS TO MAKE ROOM FOR YOUNGER ONES

Question. How many people are there in the United States over 60?

Answer. Over 11,000,000. Over 500,000 are aliens.

Question. How many of these does Dr. Townsend estimate to be engaged in productive industry?

Answer. About 4,000,000.

Question. How many over 60 are women?

Answer. Only about 5,525,000.

Question. How many of these earn over \$200 a month or have a job of fair wages for a younger person?

Answer. Few. Observe such jobs in your community. So far as the retirement of these 5,000,000 women to make room for younger workers is concerned, it may as well be left out of the calculation.

Question. Well, there still remain 5,000,000 men over 60. How about them?

Answer. Again, answer the question for yourself. How many men about you over 60 have a job they would not give up for an assured income of \$200 a month for life? Again, how few, comparatively, have jobs that would be attractive to younger men?

Displacing the aged by younger men and placing on them the burdens of supporting the aged on a scale twice as affluent as the younger men now enjoy gives no promise of helping younger men or younger people.

OTHER EXPERIMENTS

Question. Has any government adopted a plan to bring prosperity by wholesale pensions?

Answer. Yes; Alberta, Canada.

Question. What was that plan?

Answer. To pay \$25 per month to every adult, on the theory they would spend it and thus bring back prosperity.

Question. How would that amount, payable to each adult, compare with \$200 a month to each person over 60?

Answer. Approximately the same.

Question. How did the plan work in Alberta?

Answer. The candidates pledged to the plan were elected. The government went bankrupt and the officials did not dare to put the plan in effect.

RESULTS OF THE TOWNSEND PLAN

Question. Who would benefit by the Townsend plan?

Answer. Theoretically, all over 60, about 8 percent of the population.

Question. How will it affect the remainder of the people?

Answer. Most people die before 60. They would work all their lives for something neither they nor their families ever get.

Question. But would not the spending of this vast sum bring back prosperity?

Answer. It could not. It would burden our people with a tax equal to nearly one-third of the total national income, nearly one-third of all they earn to spend for themselves.

Question. What is meant by national income?

Answer. Roughly, it means the total actual income received by the entire population.

Question. But would not this pension money go into trade and business?

Answer. Yes. But this money now goes into trade, spent by those who earn it.

Question. Would the Townsend plan create any new money for circulation?

Answer. No. It would simply take existing money from those who earned it and give to others to spend. It takes from Peter to give to Paul. Peter has that much less and Paul no more than he took from Peter.

Question. How about Dr. Townsend's statement that he does not believe in saving but in spending money?

Answer. The prodigal son tried out that theory over 2,000 years ago.

OLD-AGE PENSION DESIRABLE

Question. Is not an old-age pension desirable?

Answer. Not only desirable but necessary.

Question. Would not the Townsend plan serve that necessary purpose of taking care of the needy aged?

Answer. If it would work; yes. Its unbearable burdens would lead the Nation into further poverty and distress. It would bring misfortune to all, even the pensioners themselves.

Many aged people need help. Many do not. To give to all of a ten-million class equally and on a generous scale because part of them are needy would be a folly and improvidence such as the world has never yet known.

Question. What is the true basis of aid to the needy?

Answer. That question was answered in the name of religious duty many centuries ago. Give to the needy "according to their need"; give "with an open hand." We should provide not stingily, but according also to our ability to aid them. We cannot compel 80 or 90 percent of our people to live on beans to feed 8 percent on turkey.

Question. What is a revolving fund?

Answer. A fund that is paid out on condition it will be used and repaid to the one who furnished the money. There is no revolving fund under the Townsend plan. The use of that term is a misnomer.

Question. Is there any assurance that the pension taxes will be repaid to those who pay them?

Answer. None whatever. No more than if the money was thrown to the boys in the street or paid as taxes for any other purpose.

Until we learn how to get something for nothing the Townsend plan cannot work without impoverishing the Nation.

THE WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION IN WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N. Y.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, 14, and 15 there appeared simultaneously in the Washington Post and Herald Tribune a series of articles purporting to give a picture of the Works Progress Administration as it operates in my county of Westchester. The articles filled approximately 20 columns of the papers and contained some truths, many skillfully perverted half truths, many statements wholly erroneous and misleading, and a great deal in the nature of a general and violent attack on the present administration. Under the camouflage of giving certain alleged facts to the public, the articles are in reality a Republican fulmination by two bitterly partisan newspapers.

These articles have been answered point by point by Mr. Bryan, W. P. A. administrator for Westchester and surrounding counties, but he does not touch upon the interesting background behind this rather venomous attack.

The articles were written by Mrs. Agnes Meyer, whose husband is owner of the Washington Post.

William Ward, until his death a few years ago, was for 37 years the Republican leader of Westchester, and dominated the county where Democrats were outnumbered more than three to one.

He was, however, a benevolent dictator, and his very laudable ambition was to make Westchester the model county of the United States. His plans included the setting up of an elaborate recreation department, and at its head he appointed the wife of his friend and fellow Republican, Mr. Eugene Meyer, who has a home in Westchester.

Mrs. Meyer has great executive ability, and with the aid of a highly paid staff, her own great wealth, generous appropriations from a Republican board of supervisors, and the backing of Mr. Ward she created a model department for the county and for herself a semiofficial political standing as the Lady Bountiful of Westchester.

The death of Mr. Ward was followed by strife among his political leaders and his organization began to crumble. The board of supervisors, long in secret rebellion against what they considered the extravagance of the recreation department, began to cut appropriations and even talked of closing the magnificent county recreation center.

Republican prestige began to wane and the enrollment books of 1932 showed a loss of thousands of Republican names. Mrs. Meyer is an ardent Republican worker, and this, together with the loss of prestige as dispenser of bounty, political and otherwise, probably goaded her into making her reckless statements concerning the W. P. A. and into giving to the public her interpretation of the New Deal.

THE BATTLE OF THE GUMDROPS

It is hard to take seriously her anguish over the fact that "the other day one youth idling about tossed a piece of chalk at a girl across the room. She shouted, squealed, and threw a gumdrop back at him; then, for good measure, tossed another gumdrop down the back of another girl. So much equipment was lost in this office that detectives are now looking for it." Mrs. Meyer does not tell us whether the equipment was lost during the battle of the gumdrops or if the gumdrops were a part of the equipment.

Conceding that there may be venal and unscrupulous persons among the thousands connected with the W. P. A. in one capacity or another, let us look at Mrs. Meyer's condemnation of it as a whole.

In the first paragraph of her first article Mrs. Meyer describes Mr. John Bryan, regional director, as "an engineer of repute, well regarded by everyone as a professional man." Then adds that he said to friend of hers, "Franklin Roosevelt is the man who gave us the money, and I would be the dirtiest kind of a dog traitor if I didn't see that the people

who are 100 percent for him did not receive first consideration." Mr. Bryan brands this story of Mrs. Meyer's unnamed friend as an absolute falsehood.

Mrs. Meyer in her second paragraph takes up the matter of overdue pay. This is admitted and deplored. It was due primarily to an effort on the part of the Treasury Department disbursing office to expedite pay checks at the time of decentralizing the disbursing office in Albany and setting up offices throughout the State. This has been accomplished, and delays are ended.

Mrs. Meyer claims to see "an oppressive atmosphere of terror of the Federal Government which demoralizes the relief workers." I am in close and constant touch with my county of Westchester and can discern no such atmosphere of terror. On the contrary, I find in Republicans and Democrats alike a lively appreciation of what the administration is doing through W. P. A.

Mrs. Meyer deeply resents the fact that in taking over the temporary emergency relief the W. P. A. did not take over bodily its entire staff. Mr. Bryan did absorb such of its employees as were suited to the purposes of his organization.

Mrs. Meyer bitterly resents that some features of her recreation department now come under W. P. A.'s jurisdiction and that the county works bureau was absorbed. She quotes some random cost comparisons of relief work under the bureau and W. P. A. In the matter of salary expenses she says that, prior to the advent of W. P. A., approximately 100 persons carried on the entire operation of the county works bureau while P. W. A. has a force of 250.

She fails to add that the bureau employed only about 3,000 workers, while the district in charge of Mr. Bryan comprises four counties besides Westchester and carries six times the load handled by the bureau.

Mrs. Meyer claims there is discrimination between relief workers of the two major parties, since, with a 3-to-1 majority, the great bulk of relief goes to Democrats. In proof of this she cites a list of 27 supervisors and foremen in the township of Mamaroneck, 23 of whom are Democrats.

The list is entirely misleading in that it is incomplete. She omits to name the field superintendent, a Republican, who receives top salary of \$195, and a number of general foremen in the same town, also Republicans, also receiving upper-bracket salaries. The one she lists with a blank against his name is a former Republican district leader, who has been credited with controlling the Italian vote of the township.

Since it is not the policy of the Works Progress Administration to inquire the politics of a worker, Mr. Bryan has no means of knowing the proportion of Republicans to Democrats on relief work.

If the latter are in the majority it is easily explainable. The very wealthy and the comfortably-off of Westchester are almost invariably members of the Republican Party. As such they were well taken care of during the 37 years of Mr. Ward's dictatorship. The poorer Democrats could not get jobs even as day laborers on the building of the county's beautiful parkways, a work of many years, and consequently had no reserve to fall back upon when overtaken by the depression.

Mrs. Meyers claims that totally unqualified supervisors and foremen have been appointed by Mr. Bryan, and cites in proof a number of men and their former occupations. Does Mrs. Meyer, secure in her home among the Westchester hills, not know that unemployment and stern necessity have driven men to accept any work, however humble, rather than go on relief? L. E. H., for instance, a field superintendent, is listed as a mail-truck driver. As a matter of fact, H. has been general superintendent for two large construction companies and was with the General Electric Co. as an air-conditioning engineer at one time. His experience as mail-truck driver was gained 16 years ago when, on his discharge from the Army, and having a civil-service status, he took the first job he could get until he became established in the work for which he was trained.

J. B., listed as a former beer salesman, has had experience of 15 years as superintendent of road construction. When

such work was terminated by the depression he temporarily became a beer salesman for his brother-in-law.

U. R. is listed as a saloonkeeper. Records shows no man of that name to have been on the W. P. A. pay roll. Of others listed there are none who have not a background of construction work of some kind. Is it quite fair or honest to class them as workers in jobs they held temporarily in some cases as long ago as 15 years?

Mrs. Meyer claims that field supervisors "reach out among the relief workers and population generally for the formation of new Democratic clubs in every city, village, and town." She offers no proof of this except vague mention of a "blue card" which she has not been able to obtain. If the staff of investigators and lawyers employed in helping her with her articles could not find one it can safely be classed with the mythical F. W., of Rye, whose pitiful case she cites, and the unnamed worker who, in order to get relief, was forced to drink and smoke with a long line of Democratic politicians before attaining his goal.

Does Mrs. Meyer not know that months prior to a Presidential election new political clubs spring up like mushrooms and that there is nothing criminal about a "call for meetings sent out on a postcard" to members?

Does Mrs. Meyer not know that Westchester is covered by a chain of Republican newspapers, that the need for a Democratic one becomes acute as the time comes for a Presidential election, and that one is born and dies away every 4 years? Mrs. Taylor, a district leader who has the courage to try and start one, surely merits a dinner in her honor. Neither starting a newspaper nor giving such a dinner denotes moral turpitude on the part of Democrats.

I have mentioned some of the high lights of Mrs. Meyer's articles. Mr. Bryan specifically denies others, namely:

That W. P. A. has been used in any manner to "intimidate the helpless and to destroy local government."

That he "has no power to select his subordinates—It is done for him by William Cronin, the Democratic boss."

That Democratic project supervisors receive higher pay than Republican supervisors. That "projects were more efficiently operated and at less administrative expense under the Temporary Emergency Relief than under W. P. A."

That W. P. A. is "using large sums of public money intended for the alleviation of unemployment to build a Democratic political machine."

That W. P. A. is "discriminating between American citizens in a most despotic way for political purposes."

That W. P. A. is "guilty of petty extortion from defenseless relief cases to finance local political organizations."

Is guilty of "waste, extravagance, and rank incompetence." Nor having "so intimidated the people that its tyrannical power is a menace to a free nation."

These unsubstantiated accusations are embodied throughout Mrs. Meyer's violently political outburst. It is well to remember in reading them that prejudice is vagrant opinion without any visible means of support; and a choice must be made between the statements of a person obviously biased and bitter, having no official position, and a public official chosen for outstanding and well-known qualifications and in full possession of actual facts.

RANDOLPH PERKINS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who linger upon this "bank and shoal of time" were made sad, indeed, this morning when we beheld the flag at half-mast and learned that it indicated the passing of our beloved and distinguished colleague, Hon. RANDOLPH PERKINS, of New Jersey.

It brought a keen and peculiar sadness to me because of our intimate association over a long period of years. We came to Congress at the same time—the Sixty-seventh Congress—and served together on the same committee for many years. There grew up between us one of those friendships

which has been referred to as the flowers that overhang the walls of party politics.

He was one of the best, truest, and ablest Members I have ever known.

The Sixty-seventh Congress, together with President Harding, came in on a Republican landslide. The Republicans captured more seats that year, if I am not mistaken, than have ever changed at one time in the history of the American Congress. Strange to say that Mr. PERKINS was the only one of that number remaining in the House at the time of his death.

The country and the world have undergone many changes and the political vicissitudes have been devastating, but he so held the confidence of the people of New Jersey that he was able to weather the storm, when all his colleagues on his side of the House who came in with him had either been defeated, died, or retired.

During the time that we served together on the same committee we passed through many exciting and a few bitter ordeals; but I never knew him to lose his temper or to utter a harsh or an unkind word. Yet he was firm in his convictions and did not hesitate to retain his position, regardless of pressure or criticism.

He was a profound scholar and an able lawyer. He was probably the ablest trial lawyer in either House of Congress. He was an ornament to the bar, as he was to this House.

I knew him in the intimacy of his home. I never met a more loving and loyal husband and father.

RANDOLPH PERKINS had courage, both moral and physical. Shakespeare says that—

Cowards die many times before their deaths;
The valiant never taste of death but once.

RANDOLPH PERKINS never tasted death but once. He is gone—never to be replaced. The position he occupied in this House, and especially in the affections of his fellow Members, can never be refilled.

Others will eulogize him in more fitting terms at some other time, but I could not resist the temptation to come in my feeble way to pay this humble tribute of respect, and with the hand of unfeigned friendship to place a wildflower upon his bier.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 8069. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. S. Mull;

H. R. 8599. An act to provide for a change in the designation of the Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection, to create a marine casualty investigation board, and increase efficiency in administration of the steamboat-inspection laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8766. An act to authorize municipal corporations in the Territory of Alaska to incur bonded indebtedness, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11747. An act extending the time for making the report of the commission to study the subject of Hernando De Soto's Expedition; and

H. J. Res. 439. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the Department of Labor Building of a memorial to the officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and Immigration Border Patrol, who, while on active duty, lost their lives under heroic or tragic circumstances.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE RANDOLPH PERKINS

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep personal grief that I have to announce to the House the death of our able and distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Hon. RANDOLPH PERKINS.

On another occasion doubtless the House will note his life and services.

In the meantime I offer a resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 524

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. RANDOLPH PERKINS, a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following members on the committee: Mr. LEHLBACH, Mrs. NORTON, Mr. McLEAN, and Mr. POWERS.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 26, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARING

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands of the House Tuesday, May 26, at 10:30 a. m., to discuss various bills pending before that committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. CROWE: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. House Joint Resolution 450. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial building to commemorate the winning of the Oregon country for the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BEITER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 12144. A bill for the relief of the Federal Enameling & Stamping Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2775). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACON (by request): A bill (H. R. 12839) to extend the status of veterans of the World War to persons enlisted and serving on United States Shipping Board vessels during the World War in war zones; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND (by request): A bill (H. R. 12840) to extend the laws governing inspection of vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 12841) to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Maine at or near Frenchboro, Hancock County, Maine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12842) to complete the Point Pleasant Battle Monument, Point Pleasant, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WITHROW: A bill (H. R. 12843) authorizing the State of Wisconsin to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near

La Crosse, La Crosse County, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 595) providing for an investigation of the abuses prevalent in the insurance business in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAMSAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 596) to enable the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee to conserve and stabilize the coal-mining industry within said States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 12844) for the relief of Fred W. Ross; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 12845) for the relief of John Benton Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12846) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Stagg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10965. By Mr. BEITER: Resolution passed by the housing committee of the Buffalo City Planning Association, Inc., approving of the objectives of the Wagner housing bill (S. 4424) to place housing on a permanent basis, and opposing certain provisions of the measure, especially the lack of inclusion of personnel under civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10966. By Mr. COLDEN: Resolution adopted by the Board of City Planning Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., asking favorable consideration of the Wagner housing bill (S. 4424); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10967. Also, resolution of Office Employees' Local Union, No. 15251, of Los Angeles, Calif., urging the passage of the Wagner-Allenbogen housing bill (S. 4424 and H. R. 12164); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10968. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution of the San Francisco Labor Council, protesting against unlawful and unsafe methods of drilling carried on by the United States Bureau of Reclamation in the seven tunnels at Kenneth, Calif.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

10969. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, Local No. 8; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10970. Also, petition of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, Local No. 101; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10971. Also, petition of the Chicago Federation of Labor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10972. Also, petition of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, Local No. 189; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10973. Also, petition of the city of Chicago; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10974. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the City Council of Cambridge, Mass., requesting early enactment of the United States Housing Act of 1936, Senate bill 4424 and House bill 12164; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10975. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the New York State Legislature, memorializing Congress not to reduce the tariff duty on coconut oil below a minimum of 3 cents a pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10976. Also, petition of the National Board of Young Women's Christian Association of the United States of America, affirming support of the Costigan-Wagner antilynching bill in the Senate and House; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1936

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 12, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, May 25, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on May 22, 1936, the President approved and signed the act (S. 4594) to supplement the act of June 25, 1929 (ch. 41, 46 Stat. L. 41), which authorized and directed the Attorney General to institute suit against the Northern Pacific Railway Co. and others.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|----------|----------|-------------|---------------|
| Adams | Clark | King | Radcliffe |
| Ashurst | Connally | La Follette | Reynolds |
| Austin | Coolidge | Lewis | Robinson |
| Bachman | Copeland | Loneragan | Russell |
| Bailey | Couzens | Long | Schwellenbach |
| Barkley | Davis | McAdoo | Sheppard |
| Benson | Donahey | McGill | Shipstead |
| Bilbo | Duffy | McKellar | Smith |
| Black | Fletcher | McNary | Steiger |
| Bone | Frazier | Maloney | Thomas, Okla. |
| Borah | George | Metcalf | Thomas, Utah |
| Brown | Gerry | Minton | Townsend |
| Bulkeley | Gibson | Murphy | Truman |
| Bulow | Glass | Murray | Tydings |
| Burke | Guffey | Neely | Vandenberg |
| Byrd | Hale | Norris | Van Nuys |
| Byrnes | Hatch | Nye | Wagner |
| Capper | Hayden | O'Mahoney | Walsh |
| Caraway | Holt | Overton | Wheeler |
| Carey | Johnson | Pittman | White |
| Chavez | Keyes | Pope | |

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent because of illness, and that my colleague the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of certain papers and documents on the files of the Department of the Interior which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition, which, with the accompanying list, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. NORBECK members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the City Council of Brainerd, Minn., favoring the